UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,313	12/06/2001	Blair T. Mackiewich	A363 0018 GNM/bds	9330

720 7590 05/25/2006

OYEN, WIGGS, GREEN & MUTALA LLP
480 - THE STATION
601 WEST CORDOVA STREET
VANCOUVER, BC V6B 1G1
CANADA

EXAMINER	
NGO, NGUYEN HOANG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,313	MACKIEWICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nguyen Ngo	2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11,12,18,23-25,27-31,36-38 and 41-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *8 and 18* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,11,12,23-25,27-31,36-38 and 41-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the amendment of 3/22/2006. All changes made to the Claims have been entered. Accordingly, Claims 1-9, 11-12, 18, 23-25, 27-31, 36-38, and 41-49 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 36, 41, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, the newly added limitation, "the device comprising a bridge for providing a unidirectional connection between a local interface port associated with said broadcast-based network and a remote interface port associated with said connection-based network (claim 1 lines 7-10)" does not appear to be disclosed in the specification, nor the drawings. The Examiner notes the concept of the point-to-multipoint virtual channels being unidirectional (abstract) disclosed in the specification, and further notes the phrase "designate virtual channel 30 as a unidirectional virtual channel (page 11 [0032])". Thus the specification simply shows the virtual channels (30 of figure 3 and

figure 4) as being a unidirectional connection, which is different then the newly added subject matter being claimed, "a unidirectional connection between a local interface port associated with said broadcast-based network and a remote interface port associated with said connection-based network". It should be further noted that figure 2 does not disclose any type of unidirectional connection from port 22 (local interface port) to port 24 (remote interface port), nor is there any disclosed description in the specification. The Examiner encourages the applicant to specifically point out the concept of the newly added claimed subject matter in the specification and drawings by specific page numbers.

Regarding claims 36, 41, and 45, Examiner uses the same rationale as discussed in claim 1.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1-7, 9, 19, 11, 12, 27, 28, 29, 30, 45, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamo (US 2004/0017812), hereinafter referred to as Kamo.

Regarding claim 1, Kamo discloses a method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint transmission through SVCs (a method for delivering multicast data traffic, page 3 [0051])). Kamo further discloses from figure 1 and 2 of a packet which is inputted to bridge 10 from the LAN 1, and which is transmitted to interface 19 to the SVC for the point-to-multipoint transmission, through the ATM network (originating in a broadcast-based computer network (LAN) to a plurality of destinations (multipoint) on a connection based network (ATM), page 4 [0077]). Kamo further discloses;

of a bridge which connects the LAN (broadcast) and the ATM network (a device connecting the broadcast-based network (LAN) and the connection-based network, bridge 10 of figure 1 and 2). Kamo further discloses from figure 2, of an interface 19, which provides multipoint connections to bridge 11, 12, and 13 (the bridge providing ports (interface for connections to bridge 11, 12, and 13) at which virtual channels (SCVs) in the connection-based network can terminate (local interface port (interface 15) associated with said broadcast-based network (LAN) and a remote interface port (interface 19) associated with said connection-based network (ATM)).

of a address management table of each bridge (figure 2) that retains as entries serial numbers, connections (VPI/VCI) and physical addresses of the bridges 10-13 (at said device, associating said remote interface port with a multicast address (address management table), page 3 [0060] and page 7 [0122])).

that each of the bridges connected to the ATM network sets the point-to-multipoint transmission SVC (setting up a point to multipoint virtual channel over the connection based network, page3 [0051]). Kamo further discloses that bridge 10 serves as a root, while bridges 11-13 serves as leaves (the point-to-multipoint virtual channel having a root at said remote interface port (interface 19) (interface to LAN1 at bridge 10) and a plurality of leaves at destination nodes in the connection based network (bridge 11-13), page3 [0051]).

of transmitting frames/cell through bridge 10 by comparing the outgoing VPI/VCI and the leaf ID and making each output circuit interface unit transmit the cell to only SVC corresponding VPI/VCI (forwarding (transmitting) multicast data frames (cells) addressed to the multicast address (IDs) and originating in the broadcast-based computer network (LAN1) from said remote interface port to destination nodes, figure 21).

Kamo however fails to specifically disclose a unidirectional connection between a local interface port and a remote interface port. Kamo however discloses of a bidirectional connection between interface 15 (local interface port) and interface 19 (remote interface port) as agreed upon by the applicant (remarks). It is well known in

the art that a bidirectional connection may comprise of two separate unidirectional connections, one connection transmitting data in one direction, while the other connection transmit data in the reverse direction. Kamo further discloses the concept of upward direction (LAN to ATM) and downward direction (ATM to LAN) thus providing the motivation to incorporate the unidirectional connection. It would have thus been obvious to use a unidirectional connection between ports whenever data is transmitted in a specified direction only, in order to fully utilize resources of the connection.

Regarding claim 2, Kamo discloses each LANs 1-4 be based on an Ethernet network (page 2 [0048]).

Regarding claim 3, Kamo discloses of an ATM network (100 of figure 1) with a point to multipoint connection through SVCs (page 3 [0051]) and bridge 10 being connected to LAN 1 serving as the root (page 3 [0051]).

Regarding claim 4, Kamo discloses each LANs 1-4 be based on an Ethernet network (page 2 [0048]).

Regarding claim 5, Kamo discloses that the respective bridges 10-13 are connected to other bridges through SVCs for a point-to-point transmission (point-to-point virtual channel, figure 23 and page3 [0051]). Figure 4 and figure 7 further shows that the SVCs be a bidirectional connection

Regarding claim 6 and 7, Kamo discloses from figure 7 of a bridge 22 correlating to bridge 10 as previously discussed, that uses separate connections for the point to point transmission and the point to multipoint transmission (forwarding data traffic (transmissions) destined for the first one of the destination nodes which is not associated with the one or more multicast address (a point to point connection) to a respective additional output interface (point to point port being different from point to multicast port)). Figure 4 further shows performing bidirectional return control messaging between said on of the destination nodes (leaf) and said further output interface (interface at root).

Regarding claim 9 and 19, Kamo discloses from figure 1 and 2 that the association of the multicast address and said remote interface port be a static association (page 7 [0122]).

Regarding claim 11, Kamo discloses from figure 1 of a network system in which there are provided LANs 1-4 with an ATM network and that the LANs 1-4 function as being logically one LAN connected through bridges 10-13 to the ATM network (page 2 [0048]).

Regarding claim 12, Kamo discloses each LANs 1-4 be based on an Ethernet network (page 2 [0048]).

Regarding claim 27, 28, 29, Kamo discloses the interface 15 receives an input of a frame sent from LAN1, segments the packet adapted to a storage in an information field of a cell based on AAL TypeS (carrying the frames in cells according to the AAL5 protocol) in accordance with an AAL protocol, and transmit the cell to a destination bridge (page 3 [0054]). It should be noted that frames be variable in size as this is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 30, Kamo discloses each of the bridges incorporates a spanning tree algorithm (page3 [0050]).

Regarding claim 45, Kamo discloses a network system;

in which LANs 1-4 are connected with an ATM network (a plurality of segments (LANs) interconnected by a connection-based network (ATM), page2 [0048]).

of bridges which connect the LANs (broadcast) and the ATM network (a bridge associated with each of the segments (bridge to each LAN), each bridge connecting a corresponding one of the segments (LANs) to the connection-based network (ATM), figure 1 and 2).

of bridge 10 connecting LAN1 with the ATM network (a first bridge associated with a first one of the segments, figure 1) and that bridge 10 comprises interface 19 connected to bridges 11-13 through the ATM network by means of SVC (first bridge comprises a local interface port (interface 15) connected to the first segment (LAN1)

and a plurality of remote interface ports (interface 19), each remote interface port capable of being connected to a virtual channel in the connection-based network (ATM), figure 2).

that each of the bridges connected to the ATM network sets the point-to-multipoint transmission SVC (point-to-multipoint virtual channel in the connection based network, page3 [0051]). Kamo further discloses that bridge 10 serves as a root, while bridges 11-13 serves as leaves (the point-to-multipoint virtual channel having a root node associated with said first remote interface port (interface to LAN1 at bridge 10) and a plurality of leaves (bridge 11-13), each of the leaf nodes connected to one of the bridges corresponding to another one of the segments (other LANs), page3 [0051]).

that the respective bridges 10-13 also are connected to other bridges through SVCs for a point-to-point transmission (point-to-point virtual channel in the connection based network, the p-to-p virtual channel connecting a second remote interface port to one of the bridges corresponding to another one of the segments (shown in figure 7 and figure 2), figure 7 and page3 [0051]).

Kamo however fails to specifically disclose a unidirectional connection between a local interface port and a remote interface port. Kamo however discloses of a bidirectional connection between interface 15 (local interface port) and interface 19 (remote interface port) as agreed upon by the applicant (remarks). It is well known in the art that a bidirectional connection may comprise of two separate unidirectional connections, one connection transmitting data in one direction, while the other

connection transmit data in the reverse direction. Kamo further discloses the concept of upward direction (LAN to ATM) and downward direction (ATM to LAN) thus providing the motivation to incorporate the unidirectional connection. It would have thus been obvious to use a unidirectional connection between ports whenever data is transmitted in a specified direction only, in order to fully utilize resources of the connection.

Regarding claim 47, Kamo discloses each LANs 1-4 be based on an Ethernet network (page 2 [0048]).

Regarding claim 48, Kamo discloses of an ATM network (100 of figure 1) with a point to multipoint connection through SVCs (page 3 [0051]) and bridge 10 being connected to LAN 1 serving as the root (page 3 [0051]).

Regarding claim 49, Kamo discloses;

establishing said point-to-multipoint virtual channel within said device between said remote interface port and a plurality of output interfaces based on said multicast address (control unit, page 3 [0057] and page 4 [0077] and figure 2)

establishing, across said connection-based network (ATM), a virtual connection between each said output interface and a respective destination node of said destination nodes (seen from figure 2 and figure 7). .

6. Claims 46, 23-25, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamo (US 2004/0017812) in view of Arora et al. (US 5812552), hereinafter referred to as Kamo and Arora.

Regarding claim and 46 Kamo fails to disclose the specific limitation of having the point-to-point virtual channel comprise a bidirectional virtual channel. Kamo however discloses a setup signaling process between bridge 22 (root) and bridge 23 (leaf) of figure 7, involving sending control information between the two (page 4 [0067]-[0071]), thus providing the motivation to efficiently use the point to point connection between the bridges to properly set up the transmission.

Arora further discloses a bi-directional point-to-point connection that is used for control data (col5 lines 61-66). It would thus be obvious to incorporate the use of a bi-directional point-to-point connection comprising a virtual channel as disclosed by Arora into the method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint and point-to-point transmission through SVCs as disclosed by Kamo, to efficiently setup and control the transmission between two bridges (root and leaf) through the use of the point-to-point connection. It should be noted that multicast data transmission correlates to point-to-multipoint transmissions through virtual channels, which are unidirectional in nature as known in the art.

Regarding claim 23, 24, and 25, Kamo fails to disclose the specific limitations but however discloses using an ATM network for multimedia services with proper QoS (col1

[0002]), thus providing the motivation to efficiently transmit multimedia service throughout the network according to a Quality of Service.

Arora further discloses of the multimedia application be transmitted by multicasting (point-to-multipoint) in which one end station is a transmitter and all other are receivers, and that the multimedia application include audio, video, and control information (col9 lines 47-58). It would thus be obvious to incorporate the different types of multimedia data as disclosed by Arora into the method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint and point-to-point transmission through SVCs as disclosed by Kamo, to efficiently transmit different types of multimedia services throughout the network according to a QoS.

Regarding claim 31 Kamo fails to disclose the specific limitations of configuring the point-to-point and point-to-multipoint virtual channels to provide levels of QoS, which are different from another. Kamo however discloses using an ATM network for multimedia services with proper QoS (col1 [0002]), thus providing the motivation to efficiently transmit multimedia service throughout the network according to a Quality of Service.

Arora further discloses offering guaranteed QoS on a per connection bases (page1 lines 24-30). It should be noted that a per connection bases correlates to a connection of point-to-point with a specific QoS and a point-to-multipoint with a different QoS. It would thus be obvious to incorporate the method of providing different

QoS depending on the type of connection as disclosed by Arora into the method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint and point-to-point transmission through SVCs as disclosed by Kamo, to efficiently transmit data throughout the network according to a QoS.

7. Claims 36, 37, and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamo (US 2004/0017812) in view of Patra et al. (US 6816489), hereinafter referred to as Kamo and Patra.

Regarding claim 36, Kamo discloses a method a method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint transmission through SVCs (a method for carrying multicast data traffic, page 3 [0051])). Kamo further discloses from figure 1 and 2 of a packet which is inputted to bridge 10 from the LAN 1, and which is transmitted to interface 19 to the SVC for the point-to-multipoint transmission, through the ATM network (page 4 [0077]) to destination bridges 11 and 12 that are apart of LAN 1 and 2 which function as being logically one LAN connected through bridges 10-13 to the ATM network (originating at a source segment of a virtual network (LAN1) to a plurality of destination segments of the virtual network (LAN 2 and LAN3), the source and plurality of destination segments each connected to a connection-based network (ATM) by a bridge, figure 1 and page 2[0048]). Kamo further discloses from figure 2;

of bridge 10, having a interface 15 (port) that is connected to LAN1 (at a first bridge connected to the source segment) and of a address management table of each bridge (figure 2) that retains as entries serial numbers, connections (VPI/VCI) and

physical addresses of the bridges 10-13 (associating at least one multicast address (identifiers) with a first remote interface port (correlating to bridge ID), page 3 [0060] and page 7 [0122])).

from figure 2, of an interface 19 which provides multipoint connections to bridge 11, 12, and 13 at which virtual channels (SCVs) in the connection-based network can terminate (provisioning in the connection-based network (ATM) a point to multipoint virtual channel having a root endpoint at the remote interface port (LAN1, page 3 [0051]) and a plurality of leaf nodes (bridge 11-13, page 3 [0051])).

of inputting to a packet to bridge 10 from LAN 1 with a MAC address and leaf ID (directing multicast data having said multicast address from said source segment (LAN1) of the virtual network to the first remote interface, figure 10 and figure 18 and page 4 [0077]).

and transmitting the packet to the leaf bridges as identified (page 7 [0125]) by the point to multipoint virtual connections (SCVs).

Kamo however fails to disclose of having the remote interface port be an ingress only port, but however discloses of an upward direction (LAN1 to ATM) and a backward direction (ATM to LAN1) buffers corresponding to interface 15 and 19 (page3 [0055]) and thus provides the motivation to distinguish between the direction of packet flow in a bridge for correct transmission through the ATM network. Kamo further fails to specifically disclose a unidirectional connection between a local interface port and a remote interface port. Kamo however discloses of a bidirectional connection between

interface 15 (local interface port) and interface 19 (remote interface port) as agreed upon by the applicant (remarks). It is well known in the art that a bidirectional connection may comprise of two separate unidirectional connections, one connection transmitting data in one direction, while the other connection transmit data in the reverse direction. Kamo further discloses, as mentioned above, the concept of upward direction (LAN to ATM) and downward direction (ATM to LAN) thus providing the motivation to incorporate the unidirectional connection. It would have thus been obvious to use a unidirectional connection between ports whenever data is transmitted in a specified direction only, in order to fully utilize resources of the connection.

Patra however discloses that packets are sent from an ingress port to one or more egress ports, also known as egress interfaces and that the connection between the ingress port and the switch fabric (ATM) is the incoming virtual circuit and the connection between the switch fabric and egress port is the outgoing virtual circuit (page 2 lines 25-41). It would thus be further obvious to a person skilled in the art to incorporate the ingress and egress ports as disclosed by Patra into the method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint and point-to-point transmission through SVCs as disclosed by Kamo, to efficiently distinguish between the direction of packet flow through the switch fabric (ATM).

Regarding claim 37, the combination of Kamo and Patra discloses all the limitation of claim 37, more specifically, Kamo discloses bridges 11-13 serve as leaves connected to

interface 19 (the leaf endpoints are each at a port on one of the bridges associated with one of the destination segments, figure 1 and figure 2 and page3 [0051]).

Regarding claim 41, Kamo discloses a bridge device comprising;

an interface 15 for receiving Ethernet frames from LAN1 (a bridge (22 of figure 8) for transmitting variable sized data frames (Ethernet frames) received from said first network (LAN1) at a local interface port (interface 15 of figure 8) to a first remote interface port (interface 19), page 2 [0048]).

an ATM switching network that transmits cells forwarded from respective bridges to a destination bridge (a switching fabric for switching said variable sized data frames (Ethernet frames) from said first remote interface port (input to interface 19) to a plurality of output interfaces (outputs from interface 19 to bridge 23, 24, and 25) each of said output interfaces connected to said second network (ATM)), page 3 [0049]).

of a address management table of each bridge (a filtering database, figure 2) that retains as entries serial numbers, connections (VPI/VCI) and physical addresses of the bridges 10-13 (page 3 [0060] and page 7 [0122])) and that bridge 10 becomes a root while the bridge 11 becomes a leaf, and point-to-multipoint transmission SVC is set between the bridge 10 and the bridge 11 (enabling configuration of a point-to-multipoint virtual channel with a root at said bridge (bridge 10) and a plurality of leaves each connected to one of said output interfaces (bridges connected to interface 19), page 3 [0061]).

Kamo however fails to specifically disclose a unidirectional connection between a local interface port and a remote interface port and mapping an address of said local interface port with an address of said first remote interface port. Kamo however discloses of a bidirectional connection between interface 15 (local interface port) and interface 19 (remote interface port) as agreed upon by the applicant (remarks). It is well known in the art that a bidirectional connection may comprise of two separate unidirectional connections, one connection transmitting data in one direction, while the other connection transmit data in the reverse direction. Kamo further discloses the concept of upward direction (LAN to ATM) and downward direction (ATM to LAN) thus providing the motivation to incorporate the unidirectional connection. It would have thus been obvious to use a unidirectional connection between ports whenever data is transmitted in a specified direction only, in order to fully utilize resources of the connection.

Kamo further fails to specifically disclose mapping an address of said local interface port with an address of said first remote interface port. This is simply the concept of port-to-port mapping, which is well known in the art. Kamo further discloses of a control unit consisting of an address management table that executes the SVC setting process for a point-to-multipoint transmission thus providing the motivation to correctly set up a SVC for data transmission through some type of mapping table.

Patra further discloses of a IVC-OVC mapping table which associated a IVC with an OVC (mapping (IVC-OVC mapping table) an address of said local interface port (ingress port or IVC) with an address of said first remote interface port (egress port or OVC)) leading to the proper egress port (page 10 lines 64-67) and that the logical part of the connection between the ingress port and the switch fabric is the IVC and the logical part of the connection between the switch fabric and egress port is the OVC (page 2 lines 25-43). It would thud be obvious to incorporate the IVC-OVC mapping table disclosed by Patra into the address management table that executes the SVC setting process disclosed by Kamo in order to correctly and efficiently set up a SVC for data transmission of the Ethernet frame.

Regarding claim 42, the combination of Kamo and Patra, more specifically Kamo discloses of an ATM network (100 of figure 1) with a point to multipoint connection through SVCs (page 3 [0051]) and bridge 10 being connected to LAN 1 serving as the root (page 3 [0051]).

Regarding claim 43, the combination of Kamo and Patra, more specifically Kamo discloses that the respective bridges 10-13 are connected to other bridges through SVCs for a point-to-point transmission (point-to-point virtual channel configured in the switching fabric, figure 23 and page3 [0051]). Figure 7 further shows that a point-to-point transmission uses a different output port then the point-to-multipoint transmission thus it would have been obvious to have the filtering database (mapping table) comprise

a second entry for mapping the address of said local interface port with an address of a second remote interface port (different port to port mapping for point-to-point transmission). Figure 4 further shows the exchange of bidirectional control information with a remote node (leaf).

Regarding claim 44, the combination of Kamo and Patra, more specifically Kamo discloses from figure 1, 2, and 21 of a static entry (from table) and that the bridge is configured to forward to said first remote interface port only those frames which have a multicast address which matches the static entry (figure 21).

8. Claims 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamo (US 2004/0017812) in view of Patra et al. (US 6816489), further in view of Arora et al. (US 5812552), hereinafter referred to as Kamo, Patra and Arora.

Regarding claim 38, Kamo and Patra fail to disclose the specific limitation of having a bidirectional point-to-point virtual channel in the connection-based network. Kamo however discloses a setup signaling process between bridge 22 (root) and bridge 23 (leaf) of figure 7, involving sending control information between the two (page 4 [0067]-[0071]), thus providing the motivation to efficiently use the point to point connection between the bridges to properly transmit a packet.

Arora further discloses a bi-directional point-to-point connection that is used for control data (col5 lines 61-66). It would thus be obvious to incorporate the use of a bi-

directional point-to-point connection comprising a virtual channel as disclosed by Arora into the method for a system of a plurality of bridges for a point-to-multipoint and point-to-point transmission through SVCs using ingress and egress ports as disclosed by Kamo and Patra, to efficiently setup and control the transmission between two bridges (root and leaf) through the use of the point-to-point connection. It should be noted that a plurality of bidirectional point-to-point virtual channels in the ATM network be used as seen from figure 7, bridge 23-25 being one of the destination segments.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 8, and 18 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

10 Applicant's arguments filed 3/22/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. The applicant submits Kamo fails to disclose or suggest a method which comprises providing a unidirectional connection between a local and a first remote interface port. As discussed in claim 1, Kamo however discloses of a bidirectional connection between interface 15 (local interface port) and interface 19 (remote interface port) as agreed upon by the applicant (remarks). It is well known in the art that a bidirectional connection may comprise of two separate unidirectional connections, one

connection transmitting data in one direction, while the other connection transmit data in the reverse direction. Kamo further discloses the concept of upward direction (LAN to ATM) and downward direction (ATM to LAN) thus providing the motivation to incorporate the unidirectional connection. It would have thus been obvious to use a unidirectional connection between ports whenever data is transmitted in a specified direction only, in order to fully utilize resources of the connection.

12. The applicant further submits Kamo fails to disclose "a point-to-point virtual channel in the connection-based network, the point-to-point virtual channel connecting a second remote interface port (different ports) to one of the bridges corresponding to another one of the segments". The Examiner posits that it is not unreasonable to correlate this concept to the teaching of figure 7.

Conclusion

13. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen Ngo whose telephone number is (571) 272-8398. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NN.
***

Nguyen Ngo
United States Patent & Trademark Office
Patent Examiner AU 2663
(571) 272-8398

RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER